

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/050,724	Applicant(s) HOULT ET AL.	
	Examiner Marianne L. Padgett	Art Unit 1762	

All Participants:

(1) Marianne L. Padgett.

(2) M. Stallman (answering machine).

Date of Interview: 21 December 2004

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Status of Application: after final

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: about 4:45 pm

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
art rejection of record

Claims discussed:
independent claims

Prior art documents discussed:
generally Schoen + Gelbart + Brunner


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



MARIANNE PADGETT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

Continuation of 2. NOTE: limiting the source of heating to exclude other means than claimed is a new issue, however see below comments on a possible amendment to make allowable..

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 112, 1st & 2nd as set forth in sections 2 & 3 of the action mailed 10/22/04.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: while the addition of "without external heating" to each of the independent claims would exclude heat sources other than claimed, it does not exclude additional curing means besides thermal. Schoen et al requires a combination of UV (photocuring) & thermal, where that thermal may be supplied by a variety of means including IR radiation/lasers (col.5, lines 35-50) & absorbers, dyes & pigments such as carbon black may be employed, so the heating need not be external in the sense claimed. The examiner would agree that amending to say --without external heating and without nonthermal curing-- would remove all possible options presented by the process of the applied art rejection. This would be supported by the disclosure, since all discussion & examples are directed to use of only the laser/absorber system to effect curing. If this limitation was added to the proposed amendment, as well as the below correction in claim 22, the amendment would be entered.

In claim 22, line 6, the examiner notes "100nm" is unsupported by the body of the specification & appears to be a typing error for --1000 nm--, as claimed & taught throughout the rest of the case.

The specification on p. 8, line 29 also needs the application data updated to show PN 6,494,371.

References on attached PTO-892 were found in updating the search, and are of interest, but not prior art.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: A message was left concerning a proposed Examiner's amendment that combined with the after final amendment of 12/6/04 would make the claims allowable. As Mr. Stallman was out till January & the Examiner soon would be also, this proposal would be sent in an advisory action. .